

The causes of crime cannot be corrected by mere punishment of offenders. Confinement of criminals obviously is necessary. An expanded police force—with more efficient deployment of its personnel—can help curb criminal conduct. But cure of the social sickness that besets this city—and besets every urban center in the world today—requires two conditions. It requires unqualified respect for the law on the part of those entrusted with law enforcement. And it requires from the whole community respect for human beings whatever the circumstances of their birth.

for INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO COMMUNISTS BUT DENIED TO AMERICANS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, we have heard much recently about the sources of information with reference to many of our defense establishments, and its availability to our potential enemies.

Recently, in a column written by Ed Koterba, under the heading "Assignment: Washington," there appeared an item entitled "Reds Get Information Denied to Americans." The item reads in part as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The way the President put it to the editors was: "Let's not give comfort and assistance to the enemy by publishing a lot of Government secrets."

You can't dispute the logic of that. But if only the Government would practice what it preaches.

Take, as an example, that background session for newsmen at the State Department recently. There was much said by people such as President Kennedy, Secretary Dean Rusk, and United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson that was of rather secret nature.

None of us was permitted to breathe a word of it to anybody. Yet, right there among the newsmen was Henryk Zwiren of Warsaw, taking everything down for the Communist Press Agency.

The State Department freely admitted that it goofed in letting the Communist in. But he stayed. And he took copious notes.

Now, even though the Communists have a transcript of what was said, we are still bound by State Department ruling to withhold that same information from our own people.

If you think that's silly, consider what happened just this past week at the Senate hearing on excessive Cape Canaveral wages.

I was jarred to find, at this open meeting, a huge map of the United States on the wall of the hearing room pinpointing our intercontinental ballistic missile support bases across the country.

Mikhail Sagatelyan of the Tass News Agency had as free access to the vital information on that map as I did. Location of our missile bases can indeed give comfort and assistance to the enemy.

Here is another thing the article points out:

One ridiculous example of the Pentagon violating its own doctrine of censorship happened last year when a reporter called the Defense Department for details on our air-to-air missile, the Eagle.

"Classified," said the Pentagon press man. And, I suppose, there was good reason for it to be.

But the reporter had the information before him—in the readily available 1960 Missile Handbook, a copy of which was presented to Vladimir D. Pavlov, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy.

After the story appeared in this column, the FBI stopped around to see the distributor of the handbook. Where had he gotten the secret information?

utor of the handbook. Where had he gotten the secret information?

The man replied truthfully: "From material published openly by the Pentagon."

Censorship—like charity—should begin at home.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It is time we do something about this matter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS GET INFORMATION DENIED TO AMERICANS

WASHINGTON.—The way the President put it to the editors was: "Let's not give comfort and assistance to the enemy by publishing a lot of Government secrets."

You can't dispute the logic of that. But if only the Government would practice what it preaches.

Take, as an example, that background session for newsmen at the State Department recently. There was much said by people such as President Kennedy, Secretary Dean Rusk, and United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson that was of rather secret nature.

None of us was permitted to breathe a word of it to anybody. Yet, right there among the newsmen was Henryk Zwiren of Warsaw, taking everything down for the Communist press agency.

The State Department freely admitted that it goofed in letting the Communist in. But he stayed. And he took copious notes.

Now, even though the Communists have a transcript of what was said, we are still bound by State Department ruling to withhold that same information from our own people.

If you think that's silly, consider what happened just this past week at the Senate hearing on excessive Cape Canaveral wages.

I was jarred to find, at this open meeting, a huge map of the United States on the wall of the hearing room pinpointing our intercontinental ballistic missile support bases across the country.

Mikhail Sagatelyan of the Tass News Agency had as free access to the vital information on that map as I did. Location of our missile bases can indeed give comfort and assistance to the enemy.

In fact, Sagatelyan, Zwiren, or Tass man Gennadii Shishkin—or any other Communist newsmen accredited to Washington—has as much freedom to gather military information as any U.S. Washington reporter.

So, what good does it do to aim the censorship request at editors, when the same rules do not apply to Communist correspondents?

The Tass men can be seen almost daily picking up printed material on military defense—and some revealing information can be culled from periodically published military testimony.

One ridiculous example of the Pentagon violating its own doctrine of censorship happened last year when a reporter called the Defense Department for details on our air-to-air missile, the Eagle.

"Classified," said the Pentagon press man. And, I suppose, there was good reason for it to be.

But the reporter had the information before him—in the readily available 1960 Missile Handbook, a copy of which was presented to Vladimir D. Pavlov, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy.

After the story appeared in this column, the FBI stopped around to see the distributor of the handbook. Where had he gotten the secret information?

The man replied truthfully: From material published openly by the Pentagon."

Censorship—like charity—should begin at home.

TESTING AND CONTROL OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, we are advised today that the NATO command will soon undertake an exercise to test the command and control of nuclear weapons in Western Europe. The initiation of this study, Mr. President, was in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The committee, under the leadership of its chairman, the distinguished Representative from California, CHET HOLIFIELD, made a very learned report. It happened that the President of the United States, to my knowledge, read this report carefully.

The review not only looks to the readiness of nuclear weapons, but to the danger of readiness and to possible provocation and the dangers involved, as well as the defense readiness.

I think it is well that the matter is to be reviewed and tested. It is a tribute both to the originality of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and to the study and diligence of the President of the United States.

CensorSHIP

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, after the first 100 days of the New Frontier, which has been marked by a notable lack of achievement for the public good, one thing has emerged as an accomplishment of questionable merit. Much was said during the campaign about how free information would be if only the New Frontier were elected. One was led to believe that during the preceding years the public had been kept in abject ignorance about what went on in Washington. The promises, however, have not been kept, and the press of the Nation are beginning to ask their own questions about this strange censorship. The Arizona Republic, for example, has editorially quizzed the Frontiersmen about this, and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from that newspaper be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS CENSORSHIP

After gradually working up to it in its first 100 days of office, the Kennedy administration has now committed its first act of public censorship.

This trend toward suppression of free opinion began, innocently enough, with the refusal of the White House to inform reporters of the times and places of the President's golf games.

Next, we heard that Admiral Burke and Gen. George H. Decker had had their prepared speeches censored to conform to high policy.

Next, the Department of Defense announced that there was no longer a missile gap—but then subsided into complete silence about military missiles.

Next, the two RB-47 pilots shot down by the Russians were brought back. But the administration refused to allow them to tell their story to the American people. They are still under wraps.

Next, it was announced that cooks, valets, and maids in the White House had to sign an

agreement never to write anything about their lives there.

A new censorship program at the Pentagon followed. As part of it, we were told that henceforth all nonpublic missile firings would not be announced. The new clamp-down caused Washington reporters to describe the assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs as the "Department of News Suppression."

Then in April, the President attacked the press for endangering national security. He said that from now on they should not decide what to print by asking, "Is it news?" Instead, they should ask, "Is it in the public interest?" What is the public interest? What the Kennedy administration wants us to say?

Then the administration took out after TV stations. FCC Chairman Newton W. Minow attacked TV programming and told the station owners that they would have to devote more programs to cultural and public affairs (like what the Kennedy administration is doing for the people?) To force them to do this, Minow said the FCC would exert pressure on individual stations through its power to revoke licenses. "There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license," he threatened. (Or about freedom of speech?)

On May 11, Senator HUGH SCOTT read part of a confidential memo from the special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, to department heads. It said, "Speeches of Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers do not contain sufficient reference to the President and his personal interest in, and compassion with, the problems that face the Nation. Liberal quotations from his speeches, past or present, should be used." Big brother must be made to look good—and compassionate.

But these moves toward suppression of criticism were capped last April 21. A Mr. A. G. Heinshohn, Jr., president of the Cherokee Textile Mills in Sieverville, Tenn., had bought a postage meter machine from Pitney-Bowes, Inc., a company that has a virtual monopoly from the Post Office on supplying them. They stamp envelopes and print slogans or sales ideas on envelopes. His slogan read, "This is a Republic, not a democracy—let's keep it that way."

But on April 21, a New York Post reporter called Heinshohn for comment on the fact that Pitney-Bowes, at the request of the Post Office Department, had ordered him to return the plates with the slogan on it. Heinshohn had not received this demand, since it was mailed the same day. When he did, he was told that "the slogan has become strongly identified with a controversial and partisan political issue" and so it could not be used. The John Birch Society uses it.

On April 23, the Post quoted the Post Office Department as follows: "The Department cannot delve into censorship of the message to be carried, but there is a regulation which includes the statement that slogans may not be objectionable and misleading."

Is it objectionable and misleading to call the American Republic what it is? The Arizona Republic recently ran a high school essay contest on the question, "What is the difference between a republic and a democracy?" Will the Post Office Department now ban the Republic from the mails for being objectionable and misleading? This is a republic. It is not a democracy. Is it objectionable and misleading and unprintable to tell the truth?

If the Communists should run a slogan on their envelopes, "Pray for Peace," should it be banned from the mails because it comes from Communists, even though a lot of people are praying?

If a religious group runs a slogan, "In God We Trust," will we see this soon banned from the mails as "a violation of the separation between church and state"?

This is an act of outright, illegal censorship. It is a direct assault on the freedom of the American people to write what they please and send it through the mails under the law. It reveals also the authoritarian, arrogant, and insupportably dangerous tendency of this administration to use the vast powers of government to squelch all criticism of its actions.

This violation of liberty and the Constitution cannot be allowed to stand. It must be fought with the full power of the press, the public and the Congress of the United States if freedom of speech is to live in America.

PRICES OF CERTAIN DRUGS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on May 8, during the morning hour, I described the situation that prevailed in a family that had been buying a medicinal concoction from a doctor in attempting to treat asthma. In Mount Gilead, Ohio, there was a doctor who developed a very effective formula for the treatment of asthma. The particular family to whom I refer bought the drug from the doctor for \$4 for 2 ounces. The doctor passed away. When the man wanted to buy additional drugs, he was informed that the administrator of the estate had sold the formula to a drug company of Illinois, and that the only way the drug would be available was to get it through the drug company. The patient did get the drug, but, instead of paying \$4 for 2 ounces, had to pay \$15.

I did not intend to have included in the RECORD the letter of this Ohio citizen because it mentioned the drugstore to which the patient had to go. Regrettably, the letter was included in the RECORD, and I want at this time to state that the drugstore at Ravenna, Ohio, the Clark Pharmacy, is a highly respected store. The prices of the drug-gist are reasonable. The price he had to charge was primarily the result of the price he had to pay in getting the drug from the drug company in Illinois.

Now I ask unanimous consent to have printed in this morning's RECORD a letter from the druggist, Mr. H. J. Clark, of the Clark Pharmacy, in Ravenna, Ohio.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARK'S PHARMACY,
Ravenna, Ohio, May 16, 1961.
Hon. FRANK LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senator, State of Ohio,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In defense of Clark Pharmacy, Ravenna, Ohio, and the pharmacy profession, I wish to answer the letter Mrs. Beery wrote and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1961.

I also request that this letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with Mrs. Beery's letter.

First of all, the only way my drugstore entered into this case is that the ingredients in this asthmatic formula requires a narcotic order blank, No. 2513, to acquire it for the doctor and the customer. This is a service that all pharmacists will do for the doctor and the customer.

I am enclosing a brochure on the product—what it costs the druggist and the retail price. As is noted, the cost is \$10 for 2 ounces and the retail price is \$15, which is 33½ percent markup. My operational over-

head is 30 percent, which leaves 3½ percent net.

A purchase of a shirt, tie, or a pound of hamburger has to show a net profit of at least 3½ percent or the doors would have to close.

I want to bring this point out clearly, as the druggist in the last couple of years have received very bad publicity through no fault of their own. We are very proud of our profession, and we will defend ourselves whenever the occasion arises.

I sincerely hope that this will help answer Mrs. Beery's letter from the druggist standpoint at the retail level and put a better taste in our customers' mouths in the future.

Sincerely,

H. JACK CLARK,
Registered Pharmacist.

SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the press indicates today, from many foreign sources, that there is about to be a summit conference between our President and Mr. Khrushchev. Our home press implies that this may be the case, and that the site of the conference will be in Vienna.

If such a conference is to be held, I would hope very much that some good would come of it. The whole Nation will be behind the President in pursuing whatever policy he deems necessary and wise in such a meeting with the head of the Soviet state. I do hope, however, that our American press will receive information shortly as to whether such a summit conference is or is not to be held, and also it would be most helpful to the American people and to the Members of Congress if we knew the reason for the summit conference, within the limits of security, of course.

Foreign comment today indicates that people abroad are not aware of the reason for the conference; that there is a general expression of curiosity as to why it needs to be held at this time. There is an indication that the conference is being requested by the United States, rather than by the Soviet Government.

There is concern as to what is expected to be accomplished in the handling of this important conference, and this is in the interest of the right of the American people to know, so eloquently argued by many prominent people on so many occasions.

If there is to be a summit meeting with Khrushchev, we are for whatever foreign policy procedure the President has in mind, but I do hope the American press will very soon be as adequately informed as the foreign press seems to be.

A DYING POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there was published in yesterday morning's Washington Post and Times-Herald a very penetrating article, entitled, "A Dying Policy," written by the incomparable Walter Lippmann. I think there is so much food for thought in the article that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I not only would have Members of Congress read it, but I particularly recommend it for reading by the Secretary of State and by all members of his policymaking staff.